	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/698,780	CROMWELL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	C. J. Arbes	3729
All Participants:	Status of Applicatio	n:
(1) Cheryl Eichstaedt, Reg # 50,761.	(3)	
(2) <u>C. J. Arbes</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: 16 February 2006	Time: <u>1:30 EST</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicated: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ If Yes, provide a brief description:	plicant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: N/A		
Claims discussed: 5, 7, 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 18 and 19		
Prior art documents discussed: N/A		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GE See Continuation Sheet	ENERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separadirectly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separadid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sum 	The examiner will provide a ate record of the substance of	written summary of the substance of the interview, since the interview
•		
Of ale		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Appli	cant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicants indicated that the reason for the cancellation of these above listed claims was that the Parent Application incorporated these claims directly into claims 23-31 of the Parent Application which has issued at a U.S. Patent. (Cf. accompanying Examiner's Amendment).